## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

7-15, 17, 19-20, and 24-31 are allowed. The Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

In paragraph 1 of the Ex parte Quayle office action, the Examiner stated that the substitute specification has not been entered because a marked-up copy has not been filed. In response, the Applicant submits that the substitute specification was filed on 06/20/01 in response to the Notice of Incomplete Reply dated 06/04/01, which stated that a substitute specification was required because the originally filed specification contained incorrect margins. The current attorney for this case does not have a copy of that substitute specification, which was filed by the previous attorney for this case. It is believed however that the previous attorney would have responded to the Notice of Incomplete Reply by filing a substitute specification that contained correct margins. As such, there would be no need to provide any markings on such a substitute specification since no text would have been added to or deleted from the original specification. The Applicant submits therefore that the Examiner's objection to the substitute specification has been overcome.

In paragraph 2, the Examiner required copies of the documents cited on page 11, lines 17-32, of the specification. In response, the Applicant submits herewith copies of those documents in an IDS.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that the now-pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, and early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Date: 15

Customer No. 46900

Mendelsohn & Associates, P.C. 1500 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 405

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Mendelsohn

Registration No. 35,951

Attorney for Applicant

(215) 557-6657 (phone)

(215) 557-8477 (fax)